DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 176 437 EC 120 275

AUTHOR	Engler, Richard E., Jr.; And Others
TITLE	Voices from the Classroom: Teacher Concerns with New Legislation for Serving Handicapped Children. A Report on a Study of Reactions to P.L. 94-142.
INSTITUTION	Littlejohn (Roy) Associates, Inc., Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Nov 78
CONTRACT	300-76-0328
NOTE	76p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Legislation; Elementary Secondary Education; *Handicapped Children; Rural Education; *Special Education Teachers; *Teacher Attitudes; Urban Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Education for All Handicapped Children Act; *Local Education Agencies

ABSTRACT

Teacher questions and concerns regarding the implementation of Public Law 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, were examined in visits to six local education agencies (LEAs). Types of LEAs visited included an eastern township, a southwest city, a midwest city, a remote town, and an eastern metropolis. Chapters of the report focus on the problems posed by Public Law 94-142, the settings of the visited LEAs, the teachers and their concerns, typologies of concerned teachers, and lessons learned and recommendations. Among conclusions resulting from the visits and contacts with educators are the following: that priorities of teachers are weighted by their sense of professional values and practices, that information about Public Law 94-142 has spread with great unevenness, that LEAs vary greatly in their support of teams of teachers working together on educational problems at the building level, that LEAs vary in the ways they facilitate working relationships between regular and special education teachers, and that an audit process can possibly hinder and weaken resources for education of the handicapped. The following recommendations to the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped resulted from the study: (1) create a forum for building knowledge and sharing experiences, (2) create a teachers review body at the LEA level, (3) create regional assistance teams, (4) develop and disseminate guidelines on documentation and IEP (Individualized Education Program), and (5) create policy review offices at the national level for developing and disseminating policy positions. An appendix describes the evolution of study methodology. (PHR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED176437

EC

VOICES FROM THE CLASSROOM:
Teacher Concerns With New Legislation For Serving Handicapped Children

A Report on A Study of Reactions
To PL 94-142

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

EC120275

FINAL REPORT

FOR A STUDY OF TEACHER CONCERNS WITH PL 94-142

Prepared for

BUREAU FOR EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED
(State Program Studies Branch)
DHEW

Prepared by

ROY LITTLEJOHN ASSOCIATES, INC.
1328 New York Avenue, N W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

November 1978

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface

Chapter One
THE PROBLEM POSED BY AN EDUCATION "BILL OF RIGHTS"
FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN 1

Provisions of PL 94-142 1
Listening to Those "On the Line" 3

Chapter Two
THE SETTINGS FOR TEACHER CONCERNS 7

Eastern Township 11
Southwest City 12
Midwest City 14
Northwest City 15
Remote Town 17
Eastern Metropolis 18
Concern Priorities in the LEAs 20

Chapter Three
THE TEACHERS AND THEIR CONCERNS 23

Changing Roles and Relationships 28
Bureaucratic & Organizational Pressures 34
Lack of Knowledge 36
Time and Workload Pressures 39
Lack of Information About the Law 42
Other Themes 44
Concerns Among All Persons Contacted 47

Chapter Four
TYPOLOGIES OF CONCERNED TEACHERS 50

Dimensions for Typologies 52
Involved and Hopeful 53
Involved and Skeptical 55
Uninvolved 57

TABLE OF CONTENTS - Cont'd

Chapter Five
LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS 59

Important Lessons 60
Recommendations 62

Appendix
A NOTE ON METHODS 67

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Basic Characteristics of the LEA Settings	8
Table 2.	Basic Facts on Contacts: Numbers, "No Concerns," & Experience	10
Table 3.	Primary Concerns In Each LEA	21
Table 4.	Incidence of All Cited Concerns in Each LEA	22
Table 5.	Basic Facts on the Contacts: School Type & Respondent Role	24
Table 6.	Patterns of Primary Concerns Among All Teachers Contacted	25
Table 7.	Most Frequently Cited Concerns Among All Teachers Contacted	26
Table 8.	Comparison of Primary Concerns Between Regular & Special Ed Teachers	29
Table 9.	Comparison of All Cited Concerns Between Regular & Special Ed Teachers	30
Table 10.	Primary Concerns Among Different Types of Contacts	48
Table 11.	All Cited Concerns Among Different Types of Contacts	49

PREFACE

This report is the final milestone document for the Study of Teacher Concerns With PL 94-142 (the Education For All Handicapped Children Act of 1975). It is presented by Roy Littlejohn Associates, Inc. to the Bureau for Education of the Handicapped (BEH) in partial fulfillment of Contract No. 300-76-0328.

A description of the methods which were planned and which finally evolved for this study is presented in the Appendix: A Note on Methods. The strengths and weaknesses of the study's approach are discussed in that appendix. In the main body of the report only the methods finally selected and applied are presented -- against the backdrop of the challenge of the study's objectives and the importance of discovering a feasible means of achieving those objectives.

The principal authors of this report are:

- Richard E. Engler, Jr.
- Edward Smith-Green
- Helen Kinard

These senior staff members of Roy Littlejohn Associates are particularly indebted to Mary Kennedy of the Bureau for Education of the Handicapped for her continual guidance, assistance and criticism throughout the study. They also wish to acknowledge the assistance and cooperation of educators -- especially teachers in six different settings around the country who gave of their time to speak openly, not only about their concerns regarding new responsibilities they are assuming under PL 94-142, but about their concerns for education of the nation's handicapped and non-handicapped children.

Chapter One

THE PROBLEM POSED BY AN EDUCATION "BILL OF RIGHTS" FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

The school year ending in June 1978 was a crucial one for educators throughout the United States. It marked the final year of preparatory actions before the guidelines of the educational "Bill of Rights for Handicapped Children" enacted in 1975 became fully effective.

PROVISIONS OF PL 94-142

According to the provisions of The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, a "free appropriate public education" shall be made available to all handicapped children between the ages of three and eighteen beginning in September 1978. Following in the tradition of many other efforts to overcome the stigmas and inequities which accompany imposed separation from the mainstream of American life, PL 94-142 challenges all Americans, but especially persons in the educational profession, to examine their attitudes, their perceptions and their practices with regard to the handicapped. It prompts a constant questioning of practices that would isolate and separate the handicapped child from the non-handicapped; and it mandates procedures in America's educational systems that will insure every effort is made, under public auspices, to plan for and implement educational experiences for the handicapped child that are equal to those provided for the non-handicapped.

Important features of the new regulations include:

- Handicapped children must be educated together with the non-handicapped to the "maximum extent appropriate."
- A detailed individualized education plan (IEP) must be written and followed for each handicapped child.

- Handicapped children are to have available to them the same range and variety of public school programs now available to the non-handicapped.

- Parents of the handicapped are to be guaranteed (by their state and local education agency) procedural safeguards or "due process" rights -- insuring their involvement in, and right to challenge, an individualized education plan.

Other important mandates of the law require: the development by each State of a detailed plan for educating the handicapped (to be approved by Washington), and by each local school district of a plan that meets both state and federal guidelines; the development by each State of a system of personnel development for training all persons engaged in the education of handicapped children; the creation by each State of an advisory panel to advise the state educational agency of unmet needs in the education of the handicapped.

But the basic features highlighted initially above are the essence of fact and fantasy, rumor and interpretation swirling around PL 94-142 in this first year of its implementation: education with the non-handicapped to the "maximum extent appropriate"; development of an "IEP" (with parent and child involvement) making available the "same range and variety" of public school programs as those provided the non-handicapped; guarantees of "due process" to parent and child as plans are developed and implemented.

The pressures for change in teaching the handicapped encounter the whole spectrum of institutionalized methods and procedures of one of the nation's most far-reaching institutional complexes. Still, it should not be thought that these pressures, operating in the diverse States and regions of the United States and in many thousands of distinctive local education agencies (LEAs), will uniformly and necessarily be working against the grain of established practices. For many of the lessons already learned about mainstreaming, and many of the forces generated for advocating this approach and the other mandates of PL 94-142, have indeed come from the nation's local school systems and the educators in them. Yet change, particularly legally mandated change tied to time schedules, inevitably evokes tensions and concerns. And the often-maligned and burdened teachers of our burdened schools should be expected to have faced the implementation year of PL 94-142 with some trepidations.

This report attempts to document some of the questions and concerns generated by teachers as their States, LEAs and schools acted to comply with the bill of educational rights for handicapped children.

LISTENING TO THOSE "ON THE LINE"

Certainly those entrusted by society with a special responsibility should be heard and heeded as they act to assume that responsibility. In fact, the only way that a society can learn and improve in resolving educational problems is by obtaining information from the settings where the new experiments are being carried out. As experiments in placement of the handicapped are set in motion and nurtured, it will be especially important to learn from the experiences of those "on the line" where the words of regulations and policy become translated into learning processes and into new encounters between the handicapped and the non-handicapped.

Our study was designed to obtain feedback from the classroom level at the same time that efforts to comply with PL 94-142 were being manifested all across the country. Given limited resources, our sample could not be large. And it was thought better to go to the scene of the action, even if this could only be done in a very selective and limited way, and to offer a sensitive ear for the airing of concerns rather than remaining at a distance and soliciting information through mailed questionnaires or other impersonal methods. We were prepared in our methods to listen to teachers and other educators in a number of situations: large discussion groups meeting away from school buildings; small, informal groups, perhaps encountered in a lunchroom, during a classroom break at school, or even forming over coffee in the evening after school; individuals captured for a conversation in a classroom or school hallway. Our focus in all of these varied situations was on expressed concerns and on recording them and associating them with the individual "contact" expressing them (whether in a large group, small group, or one-on-one situation).*

It was hoped that this method, of listening while also observing and seeking to comprehend the LEAs and schools being visited, would provide insight into the problem contexts and into the current reasons for expressed concerns. But even more important, a longer-range purpose was to begin the articulation of a forum of voices from the classroom -- actually a forum of many forums -- that can contribute to the sharing of experiences with educating the handicapped in the "least restrictive environment." We believe such a forum is necessary if the major results of PL 94-142 are not to be strident shouts and cries of alarm, rituals of paper compliance by administrators and increasing anxiety and resentment by teachers who feel increasingly abandoned in bearing new responsibilities delegated to them by the rest of us.

---

* A Note on Methods (Appendix) provides further details on our methods, their evolution, and their strengths and weaknesses.

Even prior to our study, rumors of concerns, and various soundings of concerns, were providing food for thought among those knowledgeable about, or at least cognizant of, PL 94-142 and its regulations. Mere exercises in logic -- considering the requirements of the Law in the light of the situations of teachers -- could produce anticipated teachers concerns. In our own preparations, after contacting a number of sources distant from the classroom and attempting to project ourselves into the role of "teacher," we anticipated the primacy of such types of concerns as those associated with:

- New time and workload demands.
- Confusions and uncertainties over changed roles and relationships (especially regarding relationships between special ed and regular ed teachers).
- Unknowns about funding and reallocations of limited funds.
- Lack of information or confusion in the transmission of information about PL 94-142.

But as we got into the study and closer to the classroom, other types of concerns began to emerge. Additional major areas of concern were found to be associated with:

- Bureaucratic and other organizational forces mediating between the federal Law and its impact in the classroom.
- The lack of and need for knowledge about educating the handicapped in the "least restrictive environment."
- Perceived pressures that threaten the teacher with loss of flexibility and professional judgment as a teacher.

The presentation which follows begins with a brief description of the varied settings in which concerns were heard, suggesting how forces in the LEA systems influence the intensity, and the content, of concerns. Thus we are interested in detecting differences in the ways LEAs mediate the impact of PL 94-142 on teachers in the classroom. Are LEAs supportive of teachers as the law is translated and resources are mobilized for addressing problems at the classroom level? How? Or is there lack of attentiveness to the law so that its meaning and impact tend merely to drift down to the classroom? Or do bureaucratic forces in the LEA tend to intensify pressures for compliance on the isolated teacher in the classroom,

who feels alone and unsupported in facing new experiences in educating handicapped children? Our descriptions of the settings visited speak to these types of forces in the LEA systems. Also highlighted are the varied histories of and present emphases in educating the handicapped and moving to comply with PL 94-142.

Our analysis of concerns culminates in a summary which attempts to identify important dimensions in possible "typologies of concerned teachers." In this study we can only suggest directions for moving toward a systematic analysis of typologies of teachers-in-situations that can be associated with modal patterns of concerns. And in the first year of implementation of PL 94-142 the most important dimension identified is that of involvement: the degree to which teachers are and have been involved in educating the handicapped, and the degree to which they are and have been involved in the implementation of the new law. Other dimensions suggested for consideration in future typologies of concerned teachers include the amount and kind of information being received by the teacher regarding PL 94-142 and its implementation and the social situation in the educational system of the teacher. Our summary speaks to these forces in the basic orientation (whether more "hopeful" or more "skeptical") of the teacher toward the future of mainstreaming.

Our primary schema, however, for organizing the findings of this study is a framework which classifies the major types of concerns. This frame of reference is used in Chapter 3 where a rich presentation of "voices from the classroom" is attempted. The categories of that classification scheme are:

- Changing Roles and Relationships
- Bureaucratic and Organizational Pressures
- Lack of Knowledge
- Time and Workload Pressures
- Lack of Information About the Law
- Financial Concerns
- Pressures from New Definitions

While emphasizing the priority concerns of teachers -- and the many varied expressions of them -- across all settings and teacher situations, this presentation also identifies, secondarily, differences in concern emphasis and expression in different LEA settings and among different types of teachers in varied situations. It prepares the way for looking more deeply, from our exploratory "soundings,"

to the reasons for concerns and strategies for resolving the problems behind the teachers' concerns.

Our purpose in this study is to foster an open climate for airing concerns about problems of and approches to educating the handicapped in the least restrictive environment. We believe that in such a climate, in which teachers in the classroom can express their experiences with "mainstreaming," knowledge can be developed and confidence gained to the betterment and enrichment of education for all the Nation's children.

Chapter Two

THE SETTINGS FOR TEACHER CONCERNS

Six local education agencies (LEAs) in different parts of the country were selected for visits to listen for teacher concerns. They covered a range of local community sizes. Moreover, an effort was made to visit LEAs in different geographic regions. Presented in the order in which they were visited, our LEAs have been designated as follows:

LEA Settings

1. Eastern Township
2. Southwest City
3. Midwest City
4. Northwest City
5. Remote Town
6. Eastern Metropolis

These settings are compared on a number of characteristics in Table 1. It can be seen in that table that our sample of LEAs:

- Ranged widely across geographic regions of the country.
- Included a small community with few schools and a large metropolis with several hundred schools.
- Included two settings of comparable moderate size and two of comparable small size.
- Included such demographic differences as:
  - A predominantly non-white setting.

Table 1

Basic Characteristics of the LEA Settings

	(Approx.) Total Population	% Non-White/ Spanish Sur. NW / Span.	School Population	No. of Schools
1. Eastern Township	50,000	10	5,500	6
2. Southwest City	650,000	52	67,000	90
3. Midwest City	130.000	10	30,000	55
4. Northwest City	150,000	9	32,000	56
5. Remote Town	30,000	82	12,000	19
6. Eastern Metropolis	2,000,000	34	260,000	362

- A predominantly Latin-American setting (in the Southwest).

- A metropolis where one-third the population was non-white.

Further providing a base for the descriptions and analyses which follow, Table 2 presents (by settings) basic facts on the persons from whom information on concerns was obtained.

We have referred to these informants as "contacts": educators, mostly teachers, contacted on site for their views on and reactions to PL 94-142.* As revealed in Table 2, the LEA settings varied considerably in the characteristics of the persons contacted for expressions of concerns. For example:

. Percentages of contacts with "no concerns" ranged from zero in the largest setting (Eastern Metropolis) to 37 percent in the smallest setting (Remote Town).

. Average years in education varied by almost 6 years (8.5 in Eastern Township to 14.3 in Northwest City).

. Average years of experience with the handicapped varied by over 6½ years (4.2 in Remote Town to 10.9 in Northwest City).

. Percentages having some experience with the handcapped were uniformly high (approaching or at 100 percent) with the exception of the smallest setting (Remote Town).

These facts on the settings for concerns provide further enlightenment to the brief narrative descriptions below.

---

* The appendix "Note on Methods" explains the different ways the "contacts" provided information (via group or individual interviews, in varied situations) and the methods whereby this information was processed for quantitative and qualitative presentation and analysis.

Table 2

Basic Facts on Contacts:
Numbers, "No Concerns," & Experience

Based on All Formal Contacts = 149

	No. of Contacts	% w/No Concerns	Av. Yrs. in Educ.	% Having Experience w/Hand'd	Av. Yrs. Experience w/Hand'd
1. Eastern Township	25	20	8.5	92	6.5
2. Southwest City	40	35	11.1	96	7.7
3. Midwest City	18	28	12.8	100	8.9
4. Northwest City	25	17	14.3	100	10.9
5. Remote Town	27	37	10.1	64	4.2
6. Eastern Metropolis	14	0	13.2	100	10.6
ALL LEAs	149	26	11.4	90	7.8

EASTERN TOWNSHIP

A comfortable bedroom suburb on the eastern seaboard was the first setting visited by our study team. Formerly a small village surrounded by truck farms and meadowlands, Eastern Township now is a fast-growing residential area and the site of a regional school system. This system has experimented in recent years with many innovations in organizing educational resources and allowing options to parents and students in the type of learning environment they prefer.

Local educators describe their school district as "progressive and innovative." Each school functions as a separate unit of the district. The school is additionally made up of mini-units that function independently, under a unit or team leader, within the school. The differentiated educational units also have curriculum content specialists assigned, staff teachers to ensure an adequate student-teacher ratio, and support services which permit the provision of teacher assistants and teacher aides. "Flexible modular scheduling" and planning for team teaching by unit faculty are a regular part of the system's innovative program and non-traditional organization. Patterns have been established which break with many of the traditional molds of public education. But these patterns were designed primarily to serve the majority who are not handicapped.

Stimulated by a State law regulating education of the handicapped, the system has paid attention to mainstreaming for some time. Each unit in the system has a learning center and resource room for the development of mainstream activities. The general classroom teacher does not have to be certified in the mainstreaming situation; however, a special ed teacher is assigned to each unit to supervise the resource room and learning center. And central to all district planning for and servicing of the handicapped are three Child Study Teams which cover the district: identifying handicapped children; working up IEPs; and explaining plans to parents. Then, in the Eastern Township scheme of things, the classroom teacher will develop <u>specific</u> educational plans and goals.

In this first year of PL 94-142, effects of implementation on most regular ed teachers were still diffuse and unfocused; but for the members of the Child Study Teams focused pressures for compliance were felt quite strongly in the LEA system. (It should be pointed out, however, that these team members did not stand alone in facing their problems since their perspective was shared by other central-level administrators.) A Child Study Team member said:

"The classroom teachers haven't really felt the effects. The teachers I inform about IEPs sort of yawn at my references to the new law and its requirements. It should be realized that the IEP is a prohibitive requirement in this district, where a child may be taught by up to eight teachers."

The Director of Student Services commented:

"I'm concerned that the law is going to intensify neglect of the ongoing cases. Marginal kids are bombarding the system because parents want to try to get the services for their child. We may see a kickback on this as people begin to feel we're paying too much attention to the handicapped."

At the classroom teacher level many concerns were anticipatory; and central to many of them were fears that Child Study Teams would not consult closely enough with teachers and that new, special skills would have to be acquired as involvement in mainstreaming increased.

Thus, some educators in Eastern Township -- mainly the Child Study Team members -- faced a tremendous challenge if the teacher resources of the total system, in their myriad unit arrangements, were finally to be mobilized and involved in the process of planning and implementing education for the handicapped in the least restrictive environment.

SOUTHWEST CITY

In this large city of the Southwestern United States plans for mainstreaming the handicapped have been operative for a number of years. A history of attending to the handicapped goes back at least 20 years, and State requirements for plans that include consideration of mainstreaming have been in effect since 1971.

Educators in Southwest City say that the new IEP differs from the old State-required "IP" mainly in the stipulation on parent involvement -- a process which, it is said, is often difficult to implement in a community where over 50 percent of the population are identified as "Spanish Surname." This is so, according to some local educators, because of a reluctance by many Spanish-speaking parents to get involved in school matters, attend formal meetings, and pay attention to papers calling for a signature. But there is a great

deal of unevenness in this picture; and, depending on the school visited, one can obtain as many descriptions of Spanish-speaking parents eager to be involved in special planning for their children as descriptions which present an opposite story.

In truth, the visit to Southwest City first presented to the study team the possibilities of considerable diversity in the individual schools of an LEA and the importance of leadership, esprit, and the organization of resources at the building level. Southwest City, in spite of its history of early efforts at mainstreaming, has physical structures and arrangements still more organized for separation of the handicapped: one special school, barrier free, operating for many years to serve the physically handicapped; two other schools serving solely children who are other-than-physically handicapped; special ed units in all the other schools of the system to handle, at a minimum, children with special learning problems. Strong criticism was heard among teachers that the LEA has made very little effort to remodel physical plants which do not lend themselves to serving the handicapped. And the problems of not being "barrier free" are a recurring theme at many building sites around the LEA.

Staff development in special ed has been a high priority in the LEA since 1977, with 353 special ed teachers clustered into 14 groups for training. The philosophy expressed at central headquarters is that the limited numbers of special ed teachers must be the leaders of the movement toward increasing mainstreaming in their schools, training and orienting other teachers. The principal is seen as a key person in this process, either facilitating or inhibiting the exercise of leadership by special ed personnel.

A large number of teachers contacted in Southwest City expressed no pressing concerns regarding the implementation of PL 94-142. Many anticipatory concerns were expressed, however -- focused on unknowns about new responsibilities and workloads. But it appeared that a sense that change was imminent had not caught hold in many classrooms; and established procedures of previous years were especially prevalent in the settings -- the school for the physically handicapped, for example -- where special services for the handicapped had been provided for many years. Mainstreaming had been a part of local educators' vocabularies for some time, although many said it had not been accompanied in the past by any special preparation of teachers. But in the first year of PL 94-142 plans and actions for increased mainstreaming seemed still to be contained within the circle of specail ed.

Although there seemed to be few concentrated, bureaucratic pressures at the classroom level in the implementation of PL 94-142, Southwest City was both supportive and somewhat neglectful and inatten-

tive in implementation. Concentrated and focused activity to promote mainstreaming did not permeate the LEA. But the lesson manifested most strongly, as numerous schools were visited, was the strength at the building level -- in some schools with strong leadership and esprit -- which enabled a school to mobilize its resources to meet any contigency. Teachers in such schools did not feel isolated and abandoned in anticipating the requirements of PL 94-142. While the nurture and support of these building-level efforts was not uniform in the LEA, certainly Southwest City was not a setting where supportive forces were being debilitated by the actions of a central bureaucracy.

MIDWEST CITY

This city in the Great Lakes region of the United States is rightfully proud of its leadership in educating the handicapped and in mainstreaming. A State law passed in 1973 mandated a process of planning (via committee) which approximates the functions of the IEP. In some schools, educators report they have been working with mainstreaming for 25 years. Current literature publicizing the rights of the handicapped child to an education describes a planning process, including due process rights of parents, mandated by the State law of 1971 (effective in 1973). And in each school visited, experience with mainstreaming and the individual school's approach and experience were explained with some pride.

A key characteristic of Midwest City's system is its decentralization and the autonomy manifested at the building level. Among the district's schools is a barrier free elementary school "For the Handicapped and Non-Handicapped" where a prime objective is:

> "To provide appropriate program integration opportunities for all children, permitting the most severely handicapped and the least handicapped to work, play, and learn together to the fullest degree allowable by individual differences."

This school is a showpiece for education planners in other cities who are seeking a model for flexible, innovative educational arrangements which facilitate mainstreaming. And other schools in the system are actively engaged in exploring future possibilities for increased mainstreaming, planning building renovations and staffing changes with this end in view. At one junior high school, the Coordinator of special ed prepared for a shift in her role which would have her: (1) support regular ed teachers in their increasing experiences with mainstreaming; (2) work on improved curriculum for the more severely handicapped the school will be receiving. The

theme of most teacher concerns was the changing roles and relationships that needed to be clarified as mainstreaming increased.

Midwest City had many characteristics of a supportive LEA. This was true largely because of the previous experience with mainstreaming which permeated the system, the many forms of supportive resources available in the individual schools, and the schools' own efforts to address the problems at the building level. One interesting negative effect of PL 94-142 was perceived at the "model" school for the handicapped and non-handicapped where it was felt that an interpretation of the new federal law was actually harming old "teaming" relationships between regular ed and special ed teachers -- relationships which fostered mainstreaming. In the past, regular and special ed teachers in an open space environment had often informally passed children back and forth during the day. But now a strict interpretation of the functions of special ed teachers, and that any special ed placement for a child required an approved formal plan subject to due process, had provoked many arguments this year and harmed the inter-teacher rapport of previous years. ("Downtown," however, it was explained that the school could ask for a "deviation" from standard policy; but no mutual agreement on rules for continuing this back-and-forth treatment had been received from the school.)

NORTHWEST CITY

If Midwest City considers itself out in front in mainstreaming, Northwest City is sure it is even farther out front -- and has been there for a longer period of time. A Special Ed Coordinator in Northwest City maintained that a classic book on mainstreaming actually described Northwest City. A State law passed in 1973, establishing rules and regulations for serving handicapped children, was subsequently strengthened in 1976. But some confusion has resulted from the fact that the State law is not completely compatible with PL 94-142, and educators are attempting to comply with both laws. State definitions of handicapping are tighter, and the "looser" federal definitions allow for the inclusion of more children. Some concern is expressed by administrative spokespersons for special ed that leadership in special ed is being taken over by the courts.

The pioneering efforts at mainstreaming in Northwest Ctiy have been carried out under the label "progressive inclusion." An administrator pointed out that their system avoids the phrase "least restrictive environment" because it has negative connotations -- that special ed in any manifestation is restrictive. Typifying the philosophy of "progressive inclusion" is the "load/de-load" approach described for one local school: where <u>all</u> handicapped are initially

assigned to regular classrooms, then "de-loaded" to various special ed situations while still remaining the primary responsibility of the original classroom teacher.

As in Midwest City, many of problems of implementing PL 94-142 in its first year in Northwest City are due to the need for revised procedures in a system which was already well into mainstreaming. But whereas in highly decentralized Midwest City most primary concerns of teachers focused on changing roles and relationships that seemed to harm the delivery of services to the handicapped, in Northwest City the primary concern most frequently heard from the classroom came down on the bureaucratic pressures which had resulted from all-out efforts to achieve "paper compliance" during the school year. Thus an LEA with a history of being supportive of many innovative efforts at mainstreaming, at the building level throughout the system, was charged with considerable bureaucratic callousness, intensifying pressures in the classroom, during the past school year. These criticisms came largely from special ed teachers, who felt victimized by the pressures for "paper compliance," and who also feared that the new requirements and looser definitions of PL 94-142 would take professional judgment of their hands. One special ed teacher said:

> "They keep changing the forms on us. There has been much more paperwork this year; and we only get administrative interpretations of the law."

Others said:

> "Our therapists were all running around on teams preparing for a BEH audit this year. We had far fewer resources available for serving handicapped children."
>
> "I heard too much in staffing meetings this year what the law says -- legalisms."

Another complained that Northwest City tries too hard to follow the letter of the law.

Aware that key administrators in the LEA had been called upon to participate in weekend retreats addressing PL 94-142, voices in the classroom were saying: "They never have any of us at those retreats. At least they ought to get down to the principals for those sessions." (Apparently unknown to many classroom teachers, school principals had been included in the retreats.)

REMOTE TOWN

If there is a site under United States jurisdiction where the requirements of PL 94-142 are felt less than in Remote Town, it would have to be a place where the LEA was completely neglectful in the implementation of that law. Still, while the effects are slow in reaching local classrooms, the first handicapped legislation was introduced to this area (a Territory of the United States) in 1976 by the Governor's HANDICAPPED CHILD FIND PROJECT (later amended to include PL 94-142). Some mainstreaming as mandated by the new law has been implemented in the school system since March 1976.

A form of mainstreaming, however, was spearheaded in Remote Town many years ago. The initial "mainstreaming" movement was given life by a handful of teachers, specifically interested in special education, who developed a set of written guidelines and procedures for special education students. Among the areas addressed by this vanguard team were:

- Evaluation: the use of a grading system that would accurately document the functional level and progress of the handicapped student;
- Placement-Promotion: the revision of placement criteria based on age as opposed to performance and functional capacity; and
- Appropriate screening and diagnosis of the special education student.

The efforts of these concerned educators, however, were marred by the lack of appropriate facilities, professional support and administrative comprehension of handicapping conditions.

Despite earlier complications, the Division of Special Education became a reality for this Territory during the 1971-1972 school year. The mandate for this Division includes the education and training of the handicapped from preschool through secondary level (an age range of three to twenty years). Interestingly, the Division is currently housed on Government Surplus Land where a federally-sponsored educational facility had been developed. The Division is staffed by the State Education Director, educational diagnostic coordinators, diagnosticians, speech therapists, audiologist, psychologists, a nurse, and resource and instructional coordinators. Assistance is also provided by VISTA & CETA, and there is other training support.

Until recently, anything having to do with the handicapped in Remote Town was principally initiated at the U.S. regional or National level because of the absence (for more than two years) of a director of special education and a supervisor of special education. During the first implementation year of PL 94-142, a number of consultants were detailed by the U.S. Regional Office of Education to develop an acceptable State Plan for special education. Presently the position of State Director of Special Education has been filled by a professional from the Regional Office, who has demonstrated a remarkable affinity for the conditions of the handicapped and the developmental needs of Remote Town.

This newly appointed director has begun to organize and redirect the energies of the local system while identifying potentially valuable special education resources among young and relatively inexperienced teachers -- fresh out of stateside universities and eager to apply their talents in neglectful Remote Town.

Significantly, whereas almost 100 percent of the educators contacted in other LEAs had had some experience in educating the handicapped, only 64 percent of those contacted in Remote Town had had some experience. As for the familiarity with the new law, administrators as well as teachers had trouble identifying it. Of teachers contacted for their views in this setting: one-third of special teachers and 40 percent of the regular education teachers said that they had "no concerns" about PL 94-142; and the majority of all teachers who expressed concerns were mainly concerned about "lack of knowledge."

EASTERN METROPOLIS

The situation regarding PL 94-142 in Eastern Metropolis is dominated by legal disputes and controversies in an LEA where an advocacy group for the handicapped continues to exert strong pressures through legal actions for mainstreaming. Tensions between this advocacy group -- which continues to receive favorable decisions from the courts -- and the local teachers organization are extremely high. Add to this the teachers' sense of "abandonment" by the school administration in its panic to achieve compliance, and the ingredients for intensified bureaucratic pressures in the classroom are complete. It was during a session in Eastern Metropolis that the term "tyranny" was proffered to described teachers' perceptions of a situation where a vast administrative apparatus simply passes on "requirements" and forces teachers in the classroom to cope as well as they can with problems that are concentrated in the classroom.

But the term "tyranny" also was associated with the law itself which, it was felt, could blot out all dialogue and replace all professional

educational judgment and knowledge with legal judgments. Outspoken teachers in Eastern Metropolis were ready to state, angrily, that special ed professionalism was being overwhelmed by the law and replaced by an administrative bureaucracy anxious to retain federal funds and fearful of an advocacy group and its lawyers (who had found a promising vehicle for building their careers). Someone asked, rhetorically: "Who can interpret the law? The District? The SEA [which the District falls back on]? The judge?" And concluded: "The lawyers on these advocacy cases dictate."

The structures and procedures for serving the handicapped (which many teachers in Eastern Metropolis feel are being shattered currently) have at their core two varieties of Multidisciplinary Teams: School-Based and District-Based. There are eight district subdivisions in the LEA and each has a team, consisting of:

Psychologist
Special Ed Supervisor
Educational Diagnostician
Administrative Assistant
to the Superintendent
Parent representative
(A nurse is optional)

School-Based Teams consist of:

Teacher (although a judge's legal ruling is that the teacher doesn't <u>have</u> to be on the team)
Counselor
Nurse

These are the teams which work up IEPs for handicapped children. It is additionally noteworthy, in characterizing the climate of polarized controversy in Eastern Metropolis, that the local teacher's organization is taking legal action to contest a court ruling (backed by HEW, on inquiry) that teachers' union officials may not accompany teachers to IEP meetings and other due process hearings unless a child's parents consent to their presence.

A strong view from the classroom in Eastern Metropolis is that kids are simply being placed in regular classrooms without preparation. And (it is said) in this unsupportive system principals (who designate counselors to be their designees on IEP teams) also go along with "dumping" because they want to get the special ed funds in their schools. In fact, some teachers feel certain that sending a child to a teacher's classroom for mainstreaming is used as a punishment by principals.

"CONCERN" PRIORITIES IN THE LEAS

Clearly there are differences in the local situations regarding the implementation of PL 94-142. Tables 3 and 4 summarize how the different LEA situations were manifested in different patterns of priority concerns in the various settings, considering all contacts (Table 3) and all expressions of concern (Table 4) identified in the study.

Table 3

Primary Concerns
In Each LEA

Percentage Distributions of Primary Concerns By LEA, Among All Contacts Expressing Concerns

	LEA					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Eastern Town	SW City	MW City	NW City	Remote Town	Eastern Met.
N*=	20	26	13	20	17	14
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Changing roles/relationships	/35/	/27/	/54/	15	18	36
Bureaucratic/org. pressures	20	15	23	/45/	6	/50/
Lack of knowledge	30	15	-	10	/65/	14
Time/workload pressures	10	15	23	25	-	-
Lack of information	5	12	-	5	6	-
Pressures from new definitions	-	15	-	-	6	-

* Number of Contacts (persons)

/ / = Most frequent

Table 4

Incidence of All Cited Concerns in Each LEA

Percentage Distributions of Concerns By LEA, Among All Expressions of Concerns

	LEA					
	1 Eastern Town	2 SW City	3 MW City	4 NW City	5 Remote Town	6 Eastern Met.
N*=	83	84	23	95	43	60
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Changing roles/relationships	19	/27/	/39/	/25/	/33/	/40/
Time/workload pressures	/23/	(20)	(22)	19	19	8
Lack of knowledge	/23/	12	9	16	(30)	17
Lack of information	18	12	4	11	7	7
Bureaucratic/org. pressures	11	13	17	(23)	9	(25)
Pressures from new definitions	5	12	9	5	2	3
Financial concerns	1	3	-	1	-	-

* Number of "Expressions of Concerns"

/ / = Most frequent

( ) = 2nd most frequent

Chapter Three

THE TEACHERS AND THEIR CONCERNS

Regardless of the setting and our efforts to gain some comprehension of it, the concerned teacher facing the requirements of PL 94-142 was the person whose voice we wanted to hear. Not all of our contacts were with teachers, since principals and other administrators and support personnel helped us to get around an LEA and also provided entree to teachers. Table 5 presents a summary on the 149 contacts made by the study personnel as the six LEAs were visited. It should be noted that administrators and other non-teaching personnel also expressed "concerns" which were recorded. We have reserved the presentation of these "concern profiles" for all informants, however, to the end of this chapter. Our primary focus in this centerpiece presentation of "voices from the classroom" is on teachers.

Contacts providing views on concerns with PL 94-142 included the following numbers of teachers:

- Fifty-five Regular Ed Teachers, (16, or 29 percent, of whom expressed "no concerns");
- Fifty Special Ed Teachers (11, or 22 percent, of whom expressed "no concerns").

Table 6 presents the picture of primary concerns inferred from the views of all teacher contacts expressing concerns. Table 7, based on a count of all distinctive expressions of concern by teachers, summarizes the appearance of the various themes in all these expressions of concern. Several points stand out in these distributions.

- The complaints and fears regarding time and work load pressures are not the most frequent major concerns.

Table 5

Basic Facts on the Contacts:
School Type & Respondent
Role

Percentage Distribution by Type of School	N = 149* (%)
Elementary	38
Senior High	29
Intermediate or Jr. High	19
Non-School Setting	14

Percentage Distribution by Role	N = 149* (%)
Regular Ed Teacher	36
Special Ed Teacher	34
Special Ed Administrator	11
Support Personnel (Counselor etc.)	10
Principal	7
Other Administrator (not Principal or Special Ed)	2

* Number of all contacts made.

Table 6

Patterns of Primary Concerns Among All Teachers Contacted

Percentage Distributions of Primary Concerns Among All Teacher Contacts Expressing Concerns

Type of Concern	N = 78 % Expressing Type as "Primary Concern"
Bureaucratic and other organizational pressures	28
Changing roles and relationships	27
Lack of knowledge about mainstreaming and the new approaches to the handicapped	23
Time and workload pressures	13
Lack of information or unclear information	5
Pressures from new definitions	3

* Number of teacher contacts expressing some concerns. Column sums to 99% due to rounding error.

Table 7

Most Frequently Cited
Concerns Among All Teachers Contacted

Percentage Distributions of Concerns
Among All Expressions of Concern

Type of Concern	N = 275 % Appearance of Concern Themes Among All Expressions of Concerns
Changing roles and relationships	28
Bureaucratic and other organizational pressures	18
Time and workload pressures	18
Lack of knowledge about mainstreaming and the new approaches to the handicapped	17
Lack of information or unclear information	12
Pressures from new definitions	5
Financial concerns	2

* Number of expressions of concern by all teachers expressing some concerns.

Most speculation about the effects of PL 94-142 and its reception among classroom teachers has postulated that the new -- still unclear -- demands on the teacher's time would evoke most concern. We did not find this to be the case; although these types of concerns were frequently expressed.

- The discontent with bureaucratic policies and procedures and the pressures felt from organizational imperatives remote from the classroom came through as an extremely strong concern theme.

This theme was sounded most strongly in settings where teachers' voices also echoed long-standing grievances represented through teacher organizations. But even in places where a shared pride in professional accomplishment was strongly manifested, it was clear that the distance between central administrators, and their priorities in implementing PL 94-142, and teachers "on the line" was great.

- The knowns (considering this year's experience) and the unknowns (anticipating the future) in the changes in the roles of teachers -- both regular and special ed -- also overshadowed specific anxieties about workload in the teachers' expressions of concern. Accompanying this theme were the frequent expressions of concern about lack of knowledge to adequately fulfill the mandate of mainstreaming.

Again, it appeared that professional values and dispositions were strong forces eliciting these types of concern. Regular ed teachers wanted to know what their role would be and how they could be prepared for it; while special ed teachers frequently expressed concern that changes (at least in the short run) were damaging their servicing of the handicapped, and they expressed hopes that future programming would not reflect a new closed orthodoxy but would be experimental, self-correcting and open to the development of new knowledge.

Among our array of concern themes, "lack of information" may be underrepresented. This is so because often statements by teachers, based on information they had received, reflected confusion in the transmission of information. But unless the teacher was clearly articulating a conscious feeling that "information" was the problem and the subject of concern, the theme recorded by the study team related to the substance of the teacher's statements. Nevertheless, problems of information regarding PL 94-142 loomed large in teacher concerns.

Tables 8 and 9 present comparisons between regular ed and special ed teachers in the priority themes of their concerns. Interesting differences are:

- Changing roles and relationships were more concern-evoking among regular ed teachers than among special ed teachers that we interviewed (in this first year of implementing PL 94-142).

- Time and workload pressures and disgruntlement with the bureaucracy were more concern-evoking for special ed teachers than for regular ed teachers -- doubtless reflecting the situation that, in most settings, requirements of implementation fell most heavily, this first year, on special ed teachers.

Let us examine these themes of concern more closely and listen to some of the statements of teachers as they expressed these types of concerns.

CHANGING ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS

The first year of PL 94-142 was one of anticipation and uncertainty among many regular ed teachers as to the role they would play in mainstreaming and the planning process for it. Some, however, were experiencing the new responsibilities and many were unhappy with special ed personnel for one reason or another.

An elementary classroom teacher (and content specialist in language arts) in Eastern Township said:

> "I hear rumors about these changes. Someone in the building told me I would be responsible for language arts for all the handicapped kids. I said: 'You've got to be kidding! I'm not trained for that.' I see a lot of special ed copout on this thing. They're crying about their workload. Why are the new requirements so different for them?"

A high school teacher in Southwest City said:

> "Kids definitely have to be trained to accept the handicapped. They can be really vicious, especially in high school. And we really have no aids -- and not enough special materials -- to cope with the situation."

Table 8

Comparison of Primary Concerns Between Regular & Special Ed Teachers

Percentage Distributions of Primary Concerns Among Regular & Special Ed Teacher Contacts Expressing Concerns

	N = 39* Reg. Ed Tchr. (%)	N = 39* Spec. Ed. Tchr. (%)
Changing role/relationships	36	18
Bureaucratic/organizational pressures	23	33
Lack of knowledge	23	23
Time/workload pressures	8	18
Lack of information	5	8
Pressures from new definitions	5	-

* Number of teachers expressing concerns.

Table 9

Comparison of All Cited Concerns
Between Regular & Special Ed
Teachers

Percentage Distributions of Concerns
For Regular & Special Ed Contacts,
Among All Their Expressions of Concerns

	N = 124* Reg. Ed. Tchr. (%)	N = 151* Spec. Ed. Tchr. (%)
Changing roles/relationships	30	24
Time/workload pressures	16	18
Lack of knowledge	19	18
Lack of information	8	14
Bureaucratic/organizational pressures	17	19
Pressures from new definitions	5	6
Financial concerns	5	2

* Number of expressions of concern.

A first grade teacher in the same district said:

> "Ifound the IEPs were being done in sections. All the actors on the committee never got together at the same time. I found myself eliminated. I was never called upon."

A middle school teacher in this district had had direct experience with mainstreaming this year -- experience which did not bode well, in her view, for the future:

> "I have an aide this year who is totally responsible for one child who is so emotionally disturbed the aide just holds her in a chair. The other students really resent this child. It's clear to me that 'due process' has nothing to do with what the principal will do for you."

An industrial arts teacher in Midwest City, referred to us because of his previous success in mainstreaming kids in his classes, said:

> "I'm very concerned about the new pressures for mainstreaming. It's impractical in a general shop class of twenty-nine. I've found it works ok in one class I have where 43 of the kids are handicapped, and I can gear the instruction to them."

In Remote Town, a high school art teacher's complaint, as she reflected on mainstreaming, was simple and pointed:

> "It's not fair to place students into classrooms where they can't keep up with the work or can't use the equipment and materials. The classroom shouldn't be used as a day care center, or for rehabilitation without proper facilities."

In Eastern Metropolis the pressures for mainstreaming, seen by many teachers there as a new and powerful orthodoxy, seemed (in the eyes of teachers) to undermine their very authority. A high school teacher said:

> "This special ed status carries into many areas of the child's self knowledge of ways he can't be touched. We can't even suspend a special ed kid, because this is considered a change in the child's program. And the kids

know this -- that they can't be touched. I think a major fault in this law is that it doesn't allow due process for teachers too."

From the special ed teacher's perspective, other concerns about changing roles and relationships were expressed.

A learning center teacher in Eastern Township said:

"The average classroom teacher is simply not prepared for mainstreaming. Those teachers need supportive help in and out of the classroom."

A special ed teacher consultant in this setting said:

"These 'emergencies' we're getting this year mean that we have to shift priorities back on all the kids we've been planning for previously. The backlogs are building up." (And reflecting on the view which the regular ed teacher holds of special ed): "They feel:'Why should I take your kid for a couple of hours in my classroom? You only have eight kids?'"

In Southwest City, a special ed teacher at a middle school expressed concern about the new pressures and procedures which backlog or bypass older procedures and have an impact in the classroom:

"The big difficulty is getting kids from Child Find tested so we know how to prepare for them. I had one child sent to me with no testing and he was literally tearing up the school. The learning center hadn't sent the workup over and it took from September to February to get him tested and placed correctly. The learning center sends the IEP over, and I'm supposed to implement it. Sometimes I'm asked for inputs as a follow-up on the IEP. But if I'm critical the learning center gets mad. I get to make no inputs in the presence of learning center people; and sometimes I don't have most of the materials called for in a plan. You know, it's a mortal sin to call the learning center."

A teacher of the hearing impaired in Midwest City said:

"I spent extra time in college in order to be able to teach both regular and special ed. Now I feel like this law is limiting me. A regular ed teacher will say to me: "Why are you able to send four of your kids to me and not receive any back in return?' This new mainstreaming emphasis is too one-directional."

A special ed teacher in Northwest City, however, had a different kind of complaint on shifting roles:

"The regular classroom teachers don't believe they have any responsibilities at all under 94-142. They think special ed should be entirely responsible for record keeping, documdntation and all those other details."

Another in Northwest City, who mainstreams with three regular ed teachers, was concerned about other aspects of one-directionality:

"Once you mainstream a child you lose contact and the ability to follow through. I sense that the regular ed teacher's class load makes it hard to do enough for the child and to really follow through. I would like to be able to continue to meet and work with the regular ed teacher so I can assist and help her. In special ed, we know the child's weaknesses. And this knowledge can get lost in the mainstream."

The problems of norming and grading handicapped children in the mainstream situation also evoked much concern from special ed teachers. Many were concerned about the new competitive situations and expressed the need for new methods and tools for assessing educational achievement. A teacher of the educable handicapped in Remote Town said:

"I'd like to see a very detailed checklist used instead of a report card. The checklist could be a detailed evaluation of exactly where a child is functioning, so both the parents and any future teachers would know exactly what has and has not been taught the student, as well as what he has mastered. It should be quite specific in pointing out mastery in various areas and regarding elements in those areas. As it stands now, some teachers make up their own report cards. Most use the existing ones as in regular classes, and that's just not appropriate."

BUREAUCRATIC AND ORGANIZATIONAL PRESSURES

Some of the loudest vocalizations of concern by teachers reverberated around this theme of "bureaucratic tyranny" and organizational imperatives that serve the needs of administrators (to "look good" and keep the money coming in) more than the needs of children in the classroom. And this was not just the case in settings where antagonisms with the "managers downtown" were deeply ingrained. In the first year of implementation, special ed teachers had felt these bureaucratic pressures more than regular ed teachers; but the latter too were seeing the heavy hand of impersonal managers in the implementation of PL 94-142.

A regular classroom teacher in Eastern Township said:

> "I really question this management model that seems to get applied everywhere in the implementation of this law. The loudest voice gets heard. And managers who jump at the loudest voice make it tough on us trying to do a job in the classroom."

A second grade teacher in Southwest City left no doubts about where she thought the problems of implementation resided:

> "We never know where the decision is made that forces the kids on us. We need to see the credentials of those who made the decision and know why they made it. If there are people making these decisions, they shouldn't be kept anonymous. We need a teacher review process. These IEP requirements meant that a lot of support services stopped while we transferred information from yellow sheets to green sheets this spring. We had to fill out the green sheets in May, although the law was in effect in October."

A fourth grade teacher in the same setting said:

> "We have too many programs. Children are numbers now. Their treatment is based on reaching for monies. We need to start teaching. There are too many interruptions and distractions now with all these programs."

A home ec teacher in Midwest City who has emotionally impaired children in her classroom said:

"The kids with 40-70 I.Q.s are really penalized by mainstreaming. I get them now because of these new pressures from the feds and from downtown to mainstream."

In Remote Town, a teacher at the middle school, fairly new to this setting, said:

"I see this area as very backward on acceptance. People even look askance at the special ed teachers. You can't simply mainstream by law when the culture's not ready. Parents attach a lot of stigma here to special ed. I'm also concerned that the feds may quit on a program before it's really given a chance."

Militant voices of regular ed teachers in Eastern Metropolis said:

"Administration now has the final say and final control, not the teachers who are in direct contact with the children. The administration is afraid of legal hassles, and it gives no support to teachers in bad situations. There is no due process for teachers. We used to have two experimental schools charged with developing models for educating the handicapped. Then the administrators took over. So now even the principal just acts on the basis of what will profit his school financially and enhance his career."

An elementary teacher in this same setting added:

"I'm the building rep for the teachers' union, and I'm sure my principal is punishing me by mainstreaming kids into my class. I get no advance notice. A child will just appear one morning with a slip of paper. I don't even know whether there are IEPs on these kids. All I do now is spend my time with the mainstreamed kids."

It seemed that bureaucratic pressures had fallen most heavily, however, on the special ed teachers in some settings. Especially in Northwest City the distance between downtown and the special ed teacher on the line seemed to have grown this past school year. Some sampled comments of special ed teachers reveal this discontent:

"The race for funding carries the day. When this IEP thing first came out this year, it tied up everyone for 90 days."

"We've been serving a record-keeping system that has real lacks anyway, but apparently meets the needs downtown."

"The emphasis this year is on making the downtown managers look good."

"This new law adds nothing positive -- at least not here in Northwest City where we're well ahead on mainstreaming. It has just changed the paperwork."

"Those administrators hired a team last summer to crank out documentation like a machine, just to meet compliance requirements. They really needed persons who know the kids persuing and developing that documentation downtown. Once in awhile they called some of us at home last summer to get first-hand information."

Final notes were added by a special ed teacher in Eastern Metropolis:

"The BEH audits just look at what's on the IEP. They don't discover what's really happening in action. It's the paper-plan IEP that gets in the way now. It gets in the way of real working relationships -- with pychologists, parents and others important to the education of children."

LACK OF KNOWLEDGE

Regular ed teachers are greatly concerned that they do not have the requisite knowledge for mainstreaming. Special ed teachers are more concerned that the new pressures for mainstreaming will blot out possibilities for continuing to develop knowledge and correct practices on the basis of what is being learned.

A second grade teacher in Eastern Township said:

"Teachers need <u>practical</u> suggestions. The district has tried to make us aware of the law. But we'll need more training -- and not just in-service. How can the teacher become an integral part of the IEP process? We'll have to learn these things."

A middle school teacher in Southwest City cited confusion in the proper procedures for working with the handicapped and had many questions about mainstreaming always being a good thing:

> "I'm concerned about the handicapped kids and I want the best for them. But what is best? I see mainstreaming as not good for many -- who really disrupt the other kids. And what are proper procedures? The counselor passed out information to us on LLD [Language/Learning Disabled] kids and said it was strictly confidential. Then I found this information posted later on the bulletin board. Kids are going around now and saying, with pride: 'I'm LLD.' I think they prefer this label now because it makes the work easier for them."

Another teacher, at the elementary level, in Southwest City questioned the knowledge of the established special ed professionals and pressed for more openness in allowing regular classroom teachers to contribute from their own knowledge and experience:

> "If we're going to do pre and post-testing, we need some validity. But the learning center people force their criteria and their indicators on us in this IEP process. We need to contribute criteria and indicators of our own."

Many teachers in Remote Town simply expressed anxiety about their own lack of knowledge. Some indicated they had little contact with special ed teachers in their work. One science teacher said, however:

> "I've had no first-hand experience with teaching the handicapped. Nevertheless, I feel I could develop an IEP for a mainstreamed child with physical or other handicaps -- provided appropriate support personnel and equipment were made available."

In Eastern Metropolis a teacher expressed the opinion:

> "Young teachers are petrified as they hear about the requirements of the new law -- for example, regarding specifying goals and objectives in the IEP. Something has to be done about those fears."

Special ed teachers had more to say regarding this problem of "knowledge" in the fostering of mainstreaming. A sampling of some of their comments follows.

From Eastern Township:

"The lesson we have learned here is that no one method is the answer for all youngsters. Although we've tried to make it so here, we've learned that mainstreaming is not the total answer. Let's learn what is do-able, and who should do it."

"I think there's a problem of standardization. But I also think all teachers should be given some special education in undergraduate schools of education in preparation for the implementation of 94-142."

"We desperately need a checklist for classes that children are to be mainstreamed into. How do you prepare a 'recipient' class? Does anyone know? And we need definitions of mainstreaming. It can be many things. There are many degrees and mixes of it."

From Southwest City:

"I worry about State categorical guidelines and steps or tracks or credit requirements. The more rules we get, the more inflexible we become -- and the less able to truly serve the child. We must be flexible in serving the handicapped. Each of them is so individualized as a problem."

From Midwest City:

"We don't have a lot of the answers, but we need to prepare ourselves to explore the questions. I'm very much for mainstreaming but it needs to be done in a cooperative spirit -- at the building level -- not on a forced basis. We need to get the community involved and committed to the philosophy of mainstreaming."

From Northwest City:

"The new law took professional judgment out of our hands. We have to test and document judgments now.

And where is the knowledge for this? We spend our time now filling out an inefficient and inappropriate package of forms."

"Criteria are being overlooked on these kids as they get lost to us (special ed teachers) in the mainstream. These are criteria of learning progress that special ed teachers know."

"Every situation -- every building -- is different; and the climate depends on the principal. We need workshops to put across special ed and mainstreaming and overcome antagonisms at the building level."

From Remote Town:

"We're so far behind here. We need to provide classes at the college level, and then provide support and follow-up for regular ed teachers at the building level."

From Eastern Metropolis:

"At first I was getting IEPs that seemed appropriate. Then I began to get kids with IEPs I couldn't live with. The sending school writes the diagnosis and the plan. And this leads to real problems for the recipient teacher and school."

TIME AND WORKLOAD PRESSURES

Although it was not their predominant primary concern, the new pressures on their time and burdens on their workload brought on by PL 94-142 definitely worried teachers. They talked about these problems a great deal. Again, concerns were largely anticipatory in the case of regular ed teachers. For example, one had heard about the placement of two Mongoloid kids in the kindergarten at her school, and she was worried about this new burden on an unprepared teacher. But for some regular ed teachers, in many instances the concerns were based on actual experiences in this first year of implementation.

An elementary teacher in Eastern Township said:

> "It's hard to bend your program to meet the new requirements. In this system, a great deal of tailoring of instruction is done; and the new priorities are going to damage these situations by lengthening the waiting time in our regular plans. We really are going to need a special person assigned in the building as the expert on IEP procedures. This person could arrange meetings, develop minutes and get them to the proper authorities, and lay out the possible uses of resources in the building."

An elementary teacher in Southwest City spoke for many others in her district.

> "I'm concerned about the new training requirements we will face this summer. Our contract says we must attend these sessions. I look on this summer requirement as an outgrowth of this new law."

Another teacher in this same district said:

> "As it is, there aren't enough teachers just for the slower students. And there are students in regular classes who should be classified as handicapped. There is no place for the kids in between. We need more classes for slow learners."

Echoing a commonly expressed view across many settings, a first grade teacher in Southwest City said:

> "Time is the factor. There's no way a teacher like me can give the extra attention the handicapped child needs. We already have so many other categories to pay special attention to."

And many other regular classroom teachers were probing for information on how to obtain extra supports -- in time and supplies, and in staff training and special assistance -- when a child is mainstreamed into the classroom.

In each setting, special ed teachers expressed concern over the problems of added workload.

A member of a Child Study Team in Eastern Township described the local situation:

> "Children come to CST attention by referral and these referrals are increasing. On my team alone we have a backlog of over 100 cases. There is no way we can comply with the law. For one thing, if a child has seven teachers, there's no way you can schedule meetings and have all seven present. And next year the plan has to be rewritten with a whole new cast of teachers."

In Southwest City a special ed teacher at the school for the physically handicapped said:

> "My room is being used for parent meetings on these IEPs. The meetings average five hours. To mainstream any of my kids you would have to provide aids for the bathroom and cafeteria...some need someone to write for them. You also would need counseling, both for the child and for the recipient teachers."

A special ed coordinator and teacher in a junior high in Midwest City spoke of the special problems of the first implementation year:

> "This has been an intense year. It's hard to partial out where the various pressures have come from. We've been doing many new things at the building level. I think the mechanics of scheduling have been the major pressures induced by the law. I caught a heavy burden on the IEPs -- coordinating them -- from January through April. I'm asking [the administrator downtown] for more help. I need more coordination support time."

Many special ed teachers in Midwest City, familiar with the old State-required plan and now facing the necessity of completing the IEP, were saying: "I wish they could incorporate the IEP into our old EPPC."

Special ed teachers in Northwest City, most disgruntled of all over the paperwork burden of the past year, combined their attacks on the downtown bureaucracy with expressions of discontent over the added workloads -- and concern over how, as a consequence, services were suffering. Comments included:

"More and more time goes into documentation and less and less goes into therapy."

"The scheduling changes and record keeping systems are impossible."

"How can I truly serve 24 kids with all this time going into record keeping? And that number is too high anyway. The answer is in new staff support: a secretary and a scheduling-and-report-writing aide."

"Wait until regular ed begins to see the record keeping falling on them. They should give us [the Special Adjustment Teachers] an extra planning period. Or it would help if they'd have the special adjustment kids start school two weeks late. That might give us time to do the records on them."

"I think we need to assign a social worker and a secretary to deal with parent involvement and all the scheduling problems. But this law isn't causing the local districts to come up with the manpower to meet the new requirements."

The very few in Remote Town were also complaining about the new load placed on them. But many there qualified their concern with enthusiasm for finally getting something going in this district. One young special-ed-trained teacher, who walked into a program only one year old at the high school, said:

"More and more special ed kids are being identified and potential dropouts are being kept. So the numbers are increasing. At first we decided to do the IEPs quarterly; but the burden was too heavy. So now we're requesting a twice-a-year procedure. People don't realize how much time and effort goes into an IEP. It's not written by a committee. It's written by a special ed teacher. Maybe next year committees will write them."

LACK OF INFORMATION ABOUT THE LAW

In truth, practically all concerns were connected to problems of information -- to noise in the channels through which information regarding PL 94-142 flows. Rumors are rampant; and unknowns far

outweigh the knowns. But as we stated before, we chose to listen to teacher communications to detect the substance of communication and have only taken note of concerns over information when teachers clearly identify the transmission of information as a problem. However, we also took note of an "information concern" when a teacher clearly asked a question for which no adequate answer had been forthcoming.

There were many requests for general, point-by-point clarification of the law and criticism about how information is confused and unclear from all levels (federal, state and local). Even in progressive and mainstream-experienced Northwest City, a coordinator handling the special ed wing of one of the district's most modern and innovative high schools said "Actually most regular ed teachers here don't know what happens in this wing." So information-flow problems around 94-142 are not unique. However, indicative of some of the pervasive unknowns regarding the law, the following questions were asked, some of them a number of times, by teachers:

"What is this IEP all about? We regular ed teachers haven't really been briefed on it."

"I'm really concerned about the liability factor. What kind of liability do teachers have?"

"Why don't the feds tell us what has to be done and how to do it? Things aren't really spelled out at a process level -- in a way that would mean something to the implementing person, the teacher."

"Who defines 'least restrictive environment'?"

"How often are IEPs supposed to be done? Is there a rule on this?"

"What does that provision in the law about serving <u>every</u> child mean?"

"Parents here are hesitant about signing papers. Can we get around this without being sued?"

"What is the procedure when a parent turns down a plan? I'm not clear on this."

"Parents cite the law to me, but they don't understand the mainstreaming clause. For those kids who will be at the school but won't be taking any regular ed classes, am I [Special ed teacher] required to provide all these classes here at the high school?"

"Is the child supposed to sign his own IEP form?"

"Why don't the teachers have due process rights under this law?"

OTHER THEMES

Two other themes identified in the statements of teachers warrant attention, although one -- financial concerns -- is noteworthy mainly because of its minor appearance. The other -- which we have identified as "pressures from new definitions" -- usually appeared in concert with other concerns, such as "role-change" problems and "load" problems; but it reflected another distinctive strain of concerns and needs to be reported upon.

Financial concerns of teachers were related to actual and perceived changes in budgeting, either associated with PL 94-142 or reporeted as particularly significant because of the new demands issuing from that law. In Eastern Township complaints were heard about the general problem of the State budget for education and the difficulty special ed people had coping with the old load of cases, let alone the greatly increasing load brought on by PL 94-142. In Southwest City, several special ed teachers noted that, at the same time this new law was changing procedures and bringing new demands, special ed funds for classroom supplies were cut back (from $175 to $75). In Northwest City, where special ed administrators were preparing for their yearly battle of the budget and presenting contingency plans for a "reduction in force," some special ed teachers were concerned that new mainstreaming guidelines would promote the flow of dollars away from special ed. One special ed teacher at a school having an "exceptional children" wing said:

"I see that adjacent elementary school getting plenty of funds for supplies, while our wing is being neglected. I think the new law has led to cuts in the budget for the handicapped. In the past, I never felt any threat of working myself out of a job as I advocated 'progressive inclusion.' But now I hear many special services people are going to be curtailed."

The concern about new definitions of the handicapped and their rights, usually a counterpart of concerns about workloads and changing roles,* came through most strongly in Eastern Township, Southwest City and Northwest City, as revealed in the following excerpts.

In Eastern Township the special ed staff -- especially the Child Study Team members -- felt strapped with new added burdens because parents pressed increasingly for the special services for their children. The administrator of student services felt that marginal kids were bombarding the system; and a Child Study Team member said that, operating under existing State rules (requiring action on a referral within ten days), her team simply could not comply with this State regulation and serve the volume flowing from the new definitions. A special ed teacher at the elementary level summed up a feeling apparently held by many in the district:

> "The Federal law focuses too much on the end of the spectrum. Our State law on the handicapped has a broader focus, and I think that is true in most places. I foresee a resistance developing because of the new federal emphasis as we sort out our attitudes and priorities and face up to the realities of what's do-able."

In Southwest City a number of teachers, both regular and special ed, sounded this concern about the negative effects of changing definitions.

A special ed teacher commented:

> "The more laws we get, the more ostracized we become in special ed. With the new volume of kids receiving special services, I feel my kids are herded together now. I sense an increased shallowness of feelings toward them."

A special ed teacher at the district's school for the physically handicapped feared that school could become a dumping ground and acquire greater backlogs as newly identified children were placed there (in the district's one truly "barrier free" school environment). She said:

---

* We identified this theme most frequently as a distinctive modifier of complaints about workload and role changes. A characteristic of its expression was that the concern was expressed for, or about, a group: persons in a given role, department or school being negatively impacted by the fact that rules defining the handicapped and their rights had changed.

"They'll send kids to us they wouldn't send to any other school. We'll be a dumping ground for the EMRs (educably and mentally retarded). And with the new law, our kids can't be picked up by voc rehab for services until they're 21 years old. Before, I could graduate kids and rehab would pick them up. Now I have to retain them."

And a teacher of the deaf, operating in a State-regional program housed in one of the district's schools, spoke of ways the "least restrictive" clause led to added burdens on existing special programs instead of new quests for innovation:

"Our program gets overloaded. This 'least restrictive environment' requirement brings many more kids to us. We get the multiple-handicapped now because they say our program provides the 'least restrictive' setting for them."

In Northwest City, the administrator for special ed explained some of the new problems the new law evoked as it came into contact with the State law. For one thing, many more aspects of the process of mainstreaming must be formalized. In "progressive inclusion," he noted, there was no formal method of assigning a special ed pupil to a general ed setting; it was a matter of practicing salesmanship with the teacher. And for a reverse flow to occur, the only requirement was that parents be informed that their child was receiving some special ed assignments. Now these processes require many formal procedures. In addition, State definitions and regulations in special ed lead to new restrictions in meeting federal pressures for mainstreaming.

Most teachers in this setting who commented on the pressures of new definitions were special ed teachers.

An elementary teacher said:

"We eliminated the resource room this year. We had less latitude in defining kids for special ed. There were children who could have used that resource room and who can't function in regular ed. But you have to have 36 kids for the room to qualify for a resource room."

An elementary special ed teacher at the local junior high/elementary school having an "exceptional" wing expressed the view of many in Northwest City:

"This law is good as pressure on settings where they haven't been doing much. But it can have real negative effects here in Northwest City -- where professionals in special ed have been out in front, delivering good services and promoting mainstreaming. I'm concerned about efforts to press the ineducable upon us. The situation presents a real challenge to professional leadership and judgment in special ed. I'm concerned that the law-givers haven't really listened to the professionals in special ed. In the years ahead, I think they should listen to us."

CONCERNS AMONG ALL PERSONS CONTACTED

This Chapter has been about teachers and their major concerns with PL 94-142. However, as we stated at the outset, other persons in the educational systems visited also contributed their views on that law and its consequences. These other educators included:

Special Ed Administrators
Support Personnel (e.g., Psychologist)
Principals
"Other" Administrators (not Special Ed or Principals)

and as a group they almost equalled in numbers the Special Ed and Regular Ed Teachers contacted.

The patterns of priority concerns of these personnel (treated as a composite group) are shown in Tables 10 and 11, where comparisons to the teachers are also shown. Noteworthy is the fact that these "others" closely resembled Regular Ed Teachers in their expressions of concern; while the truly different group in the total picture was the Special Ed Teachers: who were most concerned about "bureaucratic/organizational pressures," and (apparently) in the first year of implementation felt those pressures more than any group in the local educational systems.

Table 10

Primary Concerns
Among Different Types of Contacts

Percentage Distributions of Primary Concerns By Contact Role, Among All Contacts Expressing Concerns

	Role		
	Reg. Ed. Tchr.	Spec. Ed. Tchr.	Other**
N* =	39	39	32
	(%)	(%)	(%)
Changing roles/relationships	/36/	18	/34/
Bureaucratic/org. pressures	23	/33/	19
Lack of knowledge	23	23	22
Time/workload pressures	8	18	13
Lack of information	5	8	3
Pressures from new definitions	5	-	9

* Number of contacts in each role expressing concerns.
** "Other" includes: 13 Special Ed Administrators; 10 Support Personnel (e.g., Psychologist); 5 Principals; 4 "Other" Administrators.

/ / = Most frequent by role

Table 11

All Cited Concerns
Among Different Types of Contacts

Percentage Distribution of All Expressions of
Concerns By Contact Role

	Role		
	Reg. Ed. Tchr.	Spec. Ed. Tchr.	Other
N* =	124	151	119
	(%)	(%)	(%)
Changing roles/relationships	/30/	/24/	/28/
Time/workload pressures	16	18	19
Lack of knowledge	(19)	18	(22)
Lack of information	8	14	8
Bureaucratic/org. pressures	17	(19)	15
Pressures from new definitions	5	6	8
Financial concerns	5	2	-

* Number of expressions of concern by each role.

/ / = Most frequent by role

( ) = 2nd most frequent by role

Chapter Four

TOWARD TYPOLOGIES OF CONCERNED TEACHERS

Thinking back over the experiences with teachers in six different settings, certain pivotal contacts stand out.

Some most clearly reflected the situation of highly involved teachers who were very optimistic about the future of mainstreaming:

- The special ed coordinator and teacher in a junior high in Midwest City, vigorously working with her principal to develop plans and take new actions, and preparing to revise her role to one emphasizing support of regular ed teachers and the concurrent development of improved curriculum for the more seriously handicapped.

- The regular ed teacher at an elementary school in Southwest City where 24 handicapped children were being mainstreamed, devoted to her principal and much a part of a strong building team, that had a history of working together on educational problems.

- The hopeful and pioneering young special ed teacher in the high school in Remote Town, now being looked to by a newly appointed special ed planner as a future leader in fostering mainstreaming in the LEA.

But an even larger number of contacts who were highly involved in the education of the handicapped and the implementation of PL 94-142 were skeptical, confused and angry about that law and its implementation:

- The many knowledgeable and hard-pressed special ed teachers in Northwest City, who strongly advocate -- and are experienced in -- mainstreaming; but many of whom felt that the pressures and procedures for implementation this year had been damaging to education of the handicapped.

- The vociferous group brought together by the local teachers' union in Eastern Metropolis, eager to tell their stories -- some called them "horror stories" -- of thoughtless bureaucracy turning a deaf ear to professional values in education; and especially the young, politically active teacher who said she felt her principal tried to punish her through mainstreaming.

- The small group met one evening in a coffee shop in Southwest City; and especially the special ed teachers for the deaf and from the LEA's school for the physically handicapped, who saw irresponsible "dumping" instead of conscientious planning in local efforts to implement the law.

- The group of teachers (two regular ed, two special ed) met in the most innovative of all schools in Midwest City -- built for mainstreaming: a building where, it was said, relationships between teachers had been damaged, and teams disrupted, this year because of rulings and interpretations from "downtown."

And appearing with considerable frequency (as reflected in the fact that 26 percent of our teacher informants expressed "no concerns") were the teacher contacts who were most significantly characterized as being uninvolved:

- The many teachers in Remote Town who have hardly heard of PL 94-142 and who, in years of teaching, can scarcely recall experiences with the handicapped.

- The regular ed teachers in each setting who were not directly affected by implementation this year but were hearing rumors of new duties and responsibilities; and including those with anticipatory anxieties and a growing antagonism toward special ed -- like the regular classroom teacher in Eastern Township who said: "Me take on special ed for all language arts instruction in this building? You've got to be kidding!"

DIMENSIONS FOR TYPOLOGIES

In this summary discussion, let us recall these and other pivotal spokespersons and try to identify important dimensions in their orientations and situations regarding PL 94-142. Involvement is the key variable we have chosen as most influencing concerns and degrees of concern in the first year of implementation. Clearly, the one major difference in teachers' situations which was reflected in their expressions of concern was whether, and how, they were involved in activities of mainstreaming and particularly in activities associated with implementing PL 94-142. But we believe that useful typologies for differentiating concerned teachers (and facilitating strategies for resolving the problems behind concerns) could be developed in the future by considering and measuring at least two other significant dimensions along with involvement:

- Information: The amount and clarity of information the teacher has assimilated regarding mainstreaming and the requirements for implementing PL 94-142.

- Social Situation: The amount of group support experienced by the teacher in the working environment for teaching.

We are not prepared at this time to identify different distinctive points on a scale of information assimilation and distinctive types of social situations which could be combined with degrees of involvement to define typologies of concerned teachers; but we are prepared to offer the following general hypotheses regarding these dimensions and their relationship to concerns:

- Involvement reinforces awareness (which is a necessary condition for concerns of any kind).

- Information combines with degrees of awareness to influence concerns:

  - Unclear information received by the uninvolved contributes to anticipatory concerns.

  - Unclear information received by the involved contributes to concerns reflecting a negative orientation to the future of mainstreaming under PL 94-142.

- Lack of group supports in a teacher's working environment in the school contributes to the intensification of concerns (at any level of awareness); while strong group supports modulate concerns.

Stopping short of detailing and analyzing distinctive typologies of concerned teachers, we shall conclude our presentation by discussing some general groupings of our contacts. In this discussion, manifestations of the important dimensions cited above will be revealed.

INVOLVED AND HOPEFUL

A minority of contacts who were highly involved in mainstreaming and the implementation of PL 94-142 were confident and hopeful about the future.

The building coordinator for special ed (and teacher consultant on the physically handicapped) in a junior high school in Midwest City had been teaching the handicapped for ten years and had been involved with mainstreaming, mainly at her present school, for five years. She felt the heavy burden of the IEP process last winter and spring, but had come through it, still retaining her enthusiasm, with the support of her principal who joined with her in efforts to develop better building procedures and records. She said: "I'm very much for mainstreaming. There's no other way. I see so many negatives in the 'self-contained' situations. I hope the law will press against this. But it's much better to do it on a cooperative rather than a forced basis. I'm also trying to mainstream kids in the community -- beyond this building. Awareness and acceptance are increasing, but that's less so for the mentally impaired."

At this school a "Building Team" concept was followed. Such a team was put together as a problem of educating a handicapped child was identified. Included on the team were: the teacher; the assistant principal; and the counselor. These teams were for planning, not screening regarding special ed services. They allowed periodic review to correct and change a program. They facilitated planning and the pulling together of resources at the building level. Our involved/informed/hopeful coordinator said: "We need more reciprocal kinds of activities between regular and special ed people. And this happens best at the building level. That's where we can best overcome threats to 'turf' and build new cooperation."

A special ed teacher in an elementary school in Southwest City was hopeful and said she had no anxieties about the future. Her school, where we met with a number of teachers who described a strong, supportive principal and a history of teamwork among teachers, had 24 handicapped children being mainstreamed. She saw the new procedures as merely an extension of the present system, and she was involved in many IEPs -- mainly initiating them because of her responsibili-

ties as an EMR teacher. Although elsewhere in Southwest City we heard many complaints that Spanish-speaking parents made parent involvement tough (they avoided it, and didn't sign the forms), this teacher (Spanish-speaking herself) was very high on parent involvement and looked forward to increasing, through the new law, the rapport between the school and its neighborhood which had existed for some time.

A second grade regular ed teacher at an elementary school in Southwest City had been involved in mainstreaming for five years with a special ed teacher in the same school. She had first learned about PL 94-142 from her special ed "partner." Arrangements on mainstreaming at the school were made among teachers. She had only some anticipatory anxieties: that if classes got too big next year, teachers would begin to balk at making the kinds of arrangements that had been working smoothly for some time.

An itinerant teacher of the visually impaired, operating out of central offices in Northwest City, also seemed mainly positive and hopeful. She said the new law hadn't really changed her practices except for the new forms and formats. This teacher had been involved in mainstreaming for seven years. Her approach had been to coax and cajole teachers into mainstreaming arrangements and to plan extensively with them prior to a placement; and she continued to follow this approach and to be a catalyst for the formation of teams at the building level. She emphasized the importance of preparatory education of teachers and principals as they are readied for receiving a handicapped child. Her major fear about new procedures was that the IEP process opened new questions about who leads. "Who takes the initiative on meetings and whose responsibility is it to make out an IEP?," she asked. "Who takes the lead on a case, a regular classroom teacher or me?" She left the impression that if such procedural matters could be resolved, mainstreaming under PL 94-142 could move along in the strong currents already flowing in Northwest City.

The young special ed teacher (and chairperson of special ed) at the high school in Remote Town had only been teaching one year. She had learned about PL 94-142 two years ago in college where she had prepared herself academically for teaching special ed. In this (her first) assignment, she walked into a program established only one year. The challenge was tremendous, and she was accepting it willingly. She said: "More and more special ed kids are being identified, and potential dropouts are being retained. The numbers are increasing. We still have had no graduation for special ed. I prepared a proposal on this and they prevailed on me downtown to extend it to cover the whole Territory. Next year each special ed teacher will specialize in a subject. We're also pushing to have the special ed kids put in the regular home rooms. If our State

Plan is in effect in September, we'll be able to do this. The real crunch will be providing support and follow-up for regular ed teachers here at the school. We need classes at the college level for them." Although the IEP burden on her had been heavy this year, parent involvement had not been time consuming because of a traditionally low level of parent participation in school matters and because (she said) "we have not really had to get parents to sign off this year." Her final note of optimism: "We've even had some kids come in and request special ed this year."

INVOLVED AND SKEPTICAL

Most of our contacts represented involved teachers who were not receiving adequate information and/or found dislocations in the social system of education which intensified their concerns and left them skeptical about the future of implementation. For when the most knowledgeable and experienced classroom professionals gathered to air their views, or talked with us one-on-one, most expressed skepticism and confusion (and some anger) at what had been happening with the implementation of PL 94-142 this past school year. It will be noted that most of these concerned teachers spoke of procedural conflicts, problems of information flow, dislocated teams, or oppressive bureaucracy which (in their views) had damaged the education process. In most instances, the view was expressed that a mainstreaming process -- or at least a process for educating the handicapped -- had been damaged in the first-year implementation of PL 94-142.

Beginning in Eastern Township complaints were heard about lack of information regarding what the law implied in the light of State and local requirements and procedures. A Child Study Team member spoke of the local LEA's commitment to a mainstreaming philosophy and the (almost insurmountable) problem of the IEP requirement in an LEA where a child may be taught by up to eight teachers. She said (of this year's experiences and frustrations): "We have 12 special ed classes in the district, and I have yet to receive official word on what classes will be available next year. I have finished an evaluation for a child; but I couldn't tell his parents or meet with his teachers or formulate a specific goals program for him. That plan will go into typing as a set of alternatives."

The most striking case of concern and conflict evoked by problems of local interpretation of the law appeared also where the most damaging impact on school-team arrangements seemed to have occurred. In Midwest City, although administrators downtown explained that a school could petition for approval of arrangements that permitted working relationships between regular and special ed teachers to continue without strict lines -- completely formalized in the

specifications of IEPs -- being maintained, at that district's most innovative school for mainstreaming there was evidence of confusion about requirements and growing resentment between regular and special ed teachers. One regular ed teacher was sure the law meant simply that special ed teachers can't work with regular ed kids and that no more trading back and forth during the school day (in an open space used, flexibly, by both regular and special ed teachers) was allowed. A special ed teacher involved in this situation said: "Where I used to teach, I found a lot of resentment in placing my hearing impaired kids in a regular classroom. I never had that problem here because of the team approach and the way we could follow through and support kids in the regular classroom. Now this year the regular ed teacher says to me: 'You're sending me four kids and receiving none back in return.' Our old relationships have been damaged." Another teacher added: "I even see a difference in the kids' attitudes this year. The regular kids see the special ed kids more as 'outsiders' now. The law has provoked a lot of arguments this year among teachers."

Many in Northwest City (where experience and knowledgeability regarding mainstreaming were exceptionally high) were particularly resentful about damage to educational services brought on by rituals of compliance in the first year of implementation. They complained of record-keeping to serve paper compliance and that support for educational processes had been weakened during the year. Troubled voices (mainly of special ed teachers) were heard to say: "This year there has been much more paperwork... We only get administrative interpretations of the law.... You couldn't get therapists this year because they were all running around on teams to cover the audit.... It would relieve the pressure if they would make it clear there is leeway and time allowed for getting into compliance...." The highly involved, who were strong advocates of the local effort at "progressive inclusion," were skeptical about the future of mainstreaming under PL 94-142.

Finally, the strident voices of teachers contacted in Eastern Metropolis reflected the perceptions of those who had been involved but felt unprepared and abandoned to their own devices in the classroom. (At least one thought a principal even used mainstreaming as a punishment for a teacher held in disfavor.) Here there was confusion associated with the perceived lack of efforts throughout the local system to communicate information -- other than policies dictated by legal rulings on court cases. Teachers said: "The administration is afraid of legal hassles.... It gives no support to teachers in bad situations.... The administration responds to these travesty demands made by parents and their lawyers.... A major fault in this law is its lack of 'due process' for teachers."

UNINVOLVED

Those most completely uninvolved also tended to be uninformed. However, as the uninvolved received more information they tended (in the first year of implementation) to develop anticipatory concerns. For information being received by the uninvolved was often in the form of rumor.

We attempted no systematic exploration of each LEA and therefore cannot estimate the degree to which teachers in them remained uninvolved and uninformed. However, we found many in this situation in Remote Town where education for the handicapped was in its infancy. For example, a sixth grade teacher at an elementary school in Remote Town said she had not been informed about PL 94-142. She knew nothing about its provisions. To her knowledge, no mainstreaming occurred in her school -- or in the local district. She knew that very slow learners went to a special school part of the day and that the physically handicapped were served at another school. She said: "I see a busload of slow learners leave here every day and return in the afternoon. But I have nothing to do with them. I know two other teachers here do have responsibility for them."

Other settings turned up persons with minimal involvement; and some who acknowledged they had actually attended workshops on the law still remained relatively "uninformed." A classroom teacher at the intermediate school in Eastern Township had attended district workshops on the law but recalled little about it. She had no handicapped children this year but last year referred a visually handicapped girl for special ed planning. The teacher had not been involved in any special way with plans for this girl. She had contacted a liaison person who, in turn, was the contact with the Child Study Team. Noteworthy in our conversation with this teacher: questions about "concerns regarding PL 94-142" were misunderstood and somewhat resented. The teacher wanted to make it clear that her lack of concern about the law did not indicate a lack of concern about educating the handicapped.

As we have noted, some who were relatively uninvolved were expressing anticipatory concerns -- fed by rumors. And along with these embryonic concerns we detected growing antagonisms toward special ed teachers (as uninvolved regular ed teachers anticipated possible future responsibilities). For example, the regular ed teacher at an elementary school in Eastern township (who had been shocked by the rumor that she would soon be responsible for language arts for all the handicapped) said she had become conscious of the new law through a friend at the law center who kept telling her about PL 94-142 and that it was going to cause a lot of new problems for teachers. Her strongly voiced opinion was that many in special ed were "copping

out" in crying about their workload when, in her view, the new requirements didn't make things so different for special ed.

Although we have only suggested in this report some directions for developing typologies of concerned teachers, it will be noted in our closing chapter that the recommendations we propose take account of the major dimensions we have identified. In sum, our study of concerns has revealed:

- The importance of involvement: for eventually all teachers will assume responsibilities in the unfolding drama of mainstreaming; and all should be expected to have some concerns (which can be heard and used to beneficial ends).

- The problem of communicating information so that participants are enlightened rather than confused, and are given a sense that information-flow is intended for solving problems of educating the handicapped in the least restrictive environment.

- The importance of social supports (in educational systems) for those assuming new responsibilities -- and of procedures and actions at all levels that reinforce support to the learning processes in the classroom.

Chapter Five

LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Before attempting to summarize some of the lessons learned by this study and formulate recommendations for the future, our own role and perspective needs to be clarified. Several points may serve to explain the role we adopted in undertaking this study, at first pointing out the position we did not adopt and finally stating the position we have chosen.

> We have not attempted to be the advocates of the teachers themselves.
>
> Nor have we attempted to be advocates of the law and its formulators, or of maintaining the law in any given form.
>
> And we have not been the agents of BEH attempting to insure compliance with PL 94-142.

Our study was not a part of any auditing process emanating from BEH. At the same time, we have avoided being the advocates of teachers and their problems with "management" at any level -- since, if for no other reason, the problems and organized political positions of teachers are quite diverse around the country. What, then, has been our orientation and our role in this action-oriented study?

> We have attempted to be the advocates of having teachers' concerns with PL 94-142 heard, listened to, and thoughtfully considered as further efforts at implementation proceed.

Thus if it appears that our reporting is biased from the teachers' viewpoint, and often seems to come down harshly on "management" (without giving the latter "equal time"), we admit to this fault -- because the purpose of the study was to discover and air "teacher concerns." If should also be pointed out that what we have reported are the perceptions of situations expressed by teachers, and no effort has been made (except almost incidentally at times) to "correct" those perceptions on the basis of other information.

Moreover, it should be pointed out that we did not have to be advocates of the new law or of mainstreaming and improved educational services for the handicapped. Many of the teachers contacted were strong advocates of that law, even more were in favor of mainstreaming, and almost all favored improved education for the handicapped (although not all put the same -- or highest -- priority on that goal).

Finally, our own position on changes in the law is entirely neutral. PL 94-142 is the law under which BEH now administers funds; but our function was not to defend or justify the law's provisions, nor conversely to probe for problems with a view to undermining the law.

With this position stated, it should then be noted (in anticipating the form of our recommendations) that we are avoiding suggesting specific changes in the law. In truth, far more important at present are clarifications and the examination of allowable variations.

We obtained many recommendations from the teachers contacted. In some instances these were systematically spelled out -- for example, by the discussion group in Eastern Metropolis -- and came close to representing a position on the law by political spokespersons. In our own recommendations we have avoided, for the most part, the type of specific suggestions proposed by such teacher groups. Instead, we have attempted to speak to strategies and future lines of action that can begin to experiment with the specific kinds of changes advocated by those groups. However, in a few instances we have found specific recommendations of teachers to be insightful enough and of such general applicability that we have incorporated them into our recommended strategies.

IMPORTANT LESSONS

The following lessons stood out in our explorations into six LEAs and contacts with educators. We present them as a backdrop to our recommendations.

- Priorities of teachers are heavily weighted by their sense of professional values and knowledge of professional practices. Bargaining for time and assistance to cope with new responsibilities is partly -- if not totally -- a matter of this identification with a value system. As in any institution and profession, of course, blinders and recalcitrance to change are to be expected. But cooperation, not coercion, is most frequently cited by teachers as the key to fostering mandated change. This approach proceeds from the assumption that professionals do not have to be forced to change their ways if groups of people are working together to achieve professional goals.

- Information about PL 94-142 has spread with great unevenness, not only across different States and LEAs, but within LEAs. And even where information has been provided and assimilated, there are many unanswered questions being asked and many requests for interpretations of the law being posed.

- LEAs vary greatly in their facilitation of communication and in their support of teams of teachers working together on educational problems at the building level. And schools -- buildings -- also vary greatly in this regard.

- LEAs vary -- as do schools -- in the ways they facilitate working relationships between regular ed and special ed teachers. Some have sub-district arrangements for crucial services; some are highly centralized in coordinating special ed personnel and services; others are highly decentralized in emphasizing organization of special ed services and relationships between regular and special ed at the building level.

- Priorities for, and experiences with, educating the handicapped, and experience with mainstreaming, vary greatly across States and LEAs in the country -- and within LEAs, across schools. Some States have laws which predate PL 94-142 and which mandate educational rights of the handicapped and efforts to provide their education in nonsegregated settings. Other States are only beginning to draft such legislation, under impetus provided by PL 94-142.

- In the first year of implementation, there was tremendous variability in the involvement by teachers -- and in the pressures they felt -- in assisting their LEAs and their schools to achieve compliance with PL 94-142. Even more, there was great variability in the pressures felt by special ed and regular ed personnel; and for the most part special ed felt the greatest impact on their day-to-day functioning in the first year of implementation.

- An audit process, always necessary in some form where financial accountability is involved, can generate forces that (at least in the eyes of the teachers feeling the greatest impact) can hinder and weaken resources for education of the handicapped. Moreover, "audit" and "compliance" have different meanings and priorities for LEA administrators (worrying about program budgets) than for teachers attempting to deliver in the educational process while prompting themselves to question old ways and try new ones. The impact of an audit on the service-delivery level (i.e., "on the line") needs to be strongly considered as its requirements and procedures -- and time dimensions -- are defined.

- The law defining educational rights of the handicapped calls upon teachers to assume new and far-reaching responsibilities. Teachers are not sure what "rights" they have, along with their responsibilities, under Pl 94-142. In the first year of implementation, their questions in this regard were not being answered to their satisfaction.

RECOMMENDATIONS

During the course of the field work a number of interesting ideas were uncovered on future steps for implementing PL 94-142. The recommendations on future strategy we are presenting have in common the assumptions that:

- Beyond our present airing of "Voices from the Classroom," teachers should continue to be heard and called upon for their knowledge and experience as planning and action proceed.

- Future steps should be conducted in the spirit of, and with procedures that permit, continued learning about educating the handicapped in the "least restrictive environment" and the application of this knowledge in buildings and classrooms around the country.

Create a Forum for Building Knowledge and Sharing Experiences

Teachers manifested a great desire, not only to be heard, but to hear from others like themselves -- to learn what is happening among their peers as problems of mainstreaming are addressed. They felt strongly that most orientation workshops on PL 94-142 had not gotten to the teacher level. But this complaint was only the tip of the iceberg. For many teachers wanted to be called upon in the future to share more than their concerns. They wanted to share lessons they are learning through classroom and building-level experiences with mainstreaming and with meeting the requirements of PL 94-142.

It is recommended that projects be instituted that would: (1) identify (on a regional basis) exemplary classroom/building experiences with mainstreaming; (2) invite up to 30 teachers from a region to appear and share their experiences at a 2- or 3-day regional workshop or retreat; (3) document the workshops and disseminate this documentation; (4) instruct participants to follow through in their

LEAs by making efforts to share the workshop experience with their peers. In various LEAs, we heard the following additional thoughts on this basic idea:

- Call on several people from the same building to attend -- so that exemplary total-school programs are represented.
- But be sure to include individual teachers, making exemplary contributions, who teach in less exemplary schools.
- And don't overlook individual teachers in most difficult and isolated settings who have a strong desire to learn how to meet the requirements of PL 94-142.

The specific next-step project proposed would be only a first building-block in the development of an ongoing network of forums for developing and disseminating grass-roots knowledge regarding mainstreaming among teachers, schools and LEAs across the country.

Create a Teachers' Review Body at The LEA Level

In the implementation of the law, a condition has developed which fosters largely administrative interpretations of compliance requirements. At the same time, State and LEA administrators are not clear what the law implies or requires in many areas; but as local policies are established and effected, the teachers' perspectives are not adequately considered. It is recommended that each LEA create a teachers' review committee, addressing problems in the implementation of PL 94-142. A Teacher Review Body (committee or board) need not have dictatorial or policy-veto powers in order to have a positive influence on the climate for implementation in LEAs. It can ensure that as policies are formed on IEPs, record-keeping, diagnosis... -- on all areas of policy impacting on special and regular ed teacher roles, and especially on existing teams in buildings -- the teachers' perspectives and professional values are recognized.

Even military organizations have instituted procedures for grass-roots inputs on problems of morale, etc. -- procedures which ensure that information on problems is delivered from company to corps level (in spite of the implied threat to commanders in between).* And educational institutions should be far less command-control systems than military organizations are.

* At least this was true during Korean War days, when one of the authors of this report served on a "feedback" body -- providing information which, admittedly, "blew the minds" of battalion and regimental commanders, since, of course, there could be no problems in their units.

It is recommended that each building in an LEA have a representative to such a body. However, an elected executive committee of the Teacher Review Body might be the smaller group actually meeting to review pressing issues (while building reps would be responsible for delivering information to the smaller body).

Create Regional Assistance Teams

It is recommended that a national effort be undertaken to provide substantive assistance on a regional basis in specific problem areas identified with PL 94-142. Because of existing, and potential future, unevenness in State efforts at disseminating information, preparing for training etc., we believe this assistance should be organized on a regional basis. It may benefit from, and tap the resources of, the effort proposed under recommendation #1; but a separate effort to provide regional assistance in crucial problem areas should be instituted by BEH. Assistance should be directed to both State and LEA levels but should be concentrated on the LEAs. Problems addressed should include:

- Training regular ed teachers for new responsibilities in mainstreaming (developing curriculum and/or delivering training).
- Re-training special ed teachers....(developing curriculum and/or delivering training).
- Assisting with IEP procedures (and assisting LEA efforts to develop efficient and effective IEP procedures).

Develop and Disseminate Guidelines on Documentation and IEP Procedures

While technical assistance with the concrete problems of implementation is provided at the regional level, it is recommended that BEH proceed at the national level to develop materials (which may be applied and delivered by regional personnel, as well as otherwise disseminated) to guide LEAs in facing the formidable problem of the IEP and its documentation. This effort should not be dictatorial or lead to a standard federal package. In fact, many LEAs have record-keeping systems and procedures for IEPs which they may wish to share as contributions to national guidelines; and any external guidelines must be compatible with State and local systems. But many more LEAs doubtless would welcome an effort by outsiders to give structure to IEP procedures with a view to making them efficient, effective and minimally time-consuming.

Create Policy Review Office(s) at the National Level for Developing and Disseminating Policy Positions

A law once on the books means whatever judges and courts -- right up to the highest tribunal -- say it means. But this does not mean that the administrators of a law and other representative professional organizations should abdicate their responsibilities for continuing to interpret its mandates. At present, many teachers feel they are being abandoned by fellow educational professionals, at the local, State and Federal levels, as administrative imperatives, along with the rulings of judges, dominate the drama of implementation. In Eastern Metropolis the feeling was strong that the professional knowledge and experience of teachers was given no consideration whatsoever as implementation of PL 94-142 proceeded. They felt that teachers "on the line" could not find a sympathetic professional ear at BEH as the law found its course in legal actions.

It is recommended that policy offices be established at the national level, where implications of the law are weighed, important issues and ongoing controversies considered, and professional positions regarding interpretations developed and published. We speak of "offices" in the plural because we see roles for the major professional education associations as well as BEH in this process of developing professional positions and agency policies. These offices should not, in our view function in isolation from one another; instead, the positions of professional groups and the policies of BEH should mutually inform one another (and this process could be facilitated by a committee structure). Moreover, these offices should be continually informed by the information and knowledge being developed at the grass roots and shared through networks like that advocated in Recommendation #1.

Reviewing some of the specific problem areas cited by teachers, some of the priority problems these offices should review in early implementation phases are:

- The definition of "least restrictive" (developing guidelines for permissible variability; sharing information on experiments with varied approaches).
- Necessary staff development and staff supplementation (developing guidelines for and sharing experiences with meeting this requirement).
- Optional approaches to, and varied experiences with, meeting problems of increased workloads.
- Teacher participation in the IEP (developing guidelines for permissible variability; and sharing varied experiences with teacher participation).

- Due process for teachers: developing a national professional position regarding the rights of teachers under PL 94-142.

Policy offices should not, in our view, be constituted to receive and review specific cases or State and local problems of compliance. They should prepare and distribute interpretive guidelines for compliance; and these periodically updated guidelines should be informed constantly by what is happening in implementation (the priority problems; the varied local interpretations and solutions) in LEAs throughout the country.

Our Federal system sanctions tremendous flexibility as national laws are enacted and then catalyze varied actions in the diverse states and localities of our nation. In effect, properly functioning, our system allows us to learn from one another as the general mandates of laws are translated into myriad experiments in achieving common goals.

Therefore, we are not proposing future actions that will standardize and rigidify the requirements of implementing PL 94-142. We are recommending procedures that will promote a rich and open learning process with regard to mainstreaming in education of the handicapped. And we are also recommending procedures that will promote the development and exercise of responsible leadership in this pursuit. Finally, we wish to see teachers from the classroom drawn into that open learning process and into that exercise of leadership.

Appendix

A NOTE ON METHODS

The methods for this study evolved during the planning stage and changed slightly -- toward greater flexibility -- in the course of field work at the LEA sites.

Originally the unit for case studies was to be the individual teacher; and only five teachers were to be selected, for detailed description of their concerns. However, problems arose with:

- Identifying such persons (meeting an additional criterion of having a concern which had been resolved).
- Intervening to obtain information around such individual cases in ways which did not exacerbate or otherwise influence a situation (which, by definition, had reached a level of formal dispute).
- Generalizing adequately from such case studies of five individual teachers to truly inform the problem of teacher concerns with PL 94-142 across the country.

Because of these problems, a new unit -- the LEA -- was decided upon as the focus for a descriptive-analytical case study; and five LEAs, of different characteristics and in different regions, were selected for visitation to obtain information on "concerns" from representative groups of teachers there. However, upon briefing the Project Officer toward the close of field work, dissatisfaction was expressed with too great an emphasis on five case studies built around the LEA units -- which might lose sight of, or obscure the presentation of, the primary topic: teacher concerns. It was also decided at that time that since our sample of LEAs had not included any large metropolitan settings, a sixth site should be visited (designated here as "Eastern Metropolis") to ensure that views from the big city were obtained.

For the presentation of findings it was decided that a detailed description and comparison of the LEAs as contexts for teacher con-

cerns would be avoided. Instead, the presentation would highlight types of teacher concerns (regardless of setting) and "typologies of concerned teachers" built up from materials obtained from many individual teachers.

The original plan for field work called for a standard set of procedures to be followed at each LEA:

- A group session or sessions would be held first, at an off-school site; followed by
- individual interviews with teachers (at schools, or wherever one-on-one meetings could be arranged), following up leads to "concerned teachers" provided by persons in the group session(s).

One problem encountered early was disagreement over who should arrange the group session(s); and at first an effort was made to have one session arranged by the School Superintendent's Office and another arranged by a local teachers' organization. This procedure was only followed completely in Southwest City, however; for at other LEAs a recalcitrance was encountered in school administrations at calling groups of teachers together for a bull session at the end of the school year, when contracts were being negotiated and when feelings (because of recent audits over PL 94-142) ran high. In Eastern Township, one group session was held, arranged by the central administrator of student services, and in Eastern Metropolis all information was obtained in a group session arranged by the local teachers' organization after the school year had ended. In other settings the emphasis was on visiting schools and obtaining views of teachers in many situations, sometimes in small informal groups, sometimes in individual meetings under varied conditions. And in the course of visits to all sites (except Eastern Metropolis), some teacher contacts were made in the course of visits to schools.

The unit for quantification in the analysis is the "contact" -- a person on whom basic background information was obtained and from whom some reaction (or neutrality) on PL 94-142 was recorded. For persons "contacted" in large group sessions, views were associated with names of individuals contributing to the discussion and, later, notes recording these views were cut and pasted on sheets identifying the individual contacts. Each contact was later coded for a primary concern theme (based on the field analysts' inferences from the recorded materials). Then all concern statements on the contact sheets were also coded. This means that more vociferous informants contributed more than less vociferous ones to the total N of "all concern statements" tabulated.

The varied emphases in methods at different sites also contributed variability to the tone and content of the information on concerns obtained from contacts. For example: our only contact point in Eastern Metropolis was a large group session with a group brought together by the local teachers' organization; in Midwest City, all contacts were made in schools in the course of touring them; in Northwest City, our visit was more centrally coordinated (however, our findings reveal that the teachers contacted in school visits there were not guarded in expressing their views).

A strong caveat is required about the quantification presented in the analysis. In no way should tests of significance be applied to our statistics. Our "samples" and methods were varied and were designed to ensure obtaining rich feedback on concerns. But the effort to quantify does allow us to sift through multifarious materials and seek patterns. It gives some structure to data that were captured in many forms and required organization for presentation. However, the qualitative materials reflecting statements of concerns are the essence of this report.

We have presented these qualitative materials largely in the form of quotations. However, "quoted" statements are actually paraphrased by the analysts from materials recorded in their notes and should not be attributed word for word to the informants.

Given our broad focus, we could not attempt to differentiate (except very minimally) between different kinds of handicaps in our observations and analyses. We did attempt to discover the various types of handicapping conditions in each LEA for which mainstreaming is planned; and we tried desperately to record and comprehend each district's terminology (EMR, LLD, LD, etc.). But the fuller story, in which teachers and children are at least differentiated by type of handicapping condition, remains to be told. Even in that story, however, it should be noted that the very concept of an individualized plan in educating handicapped children stands as a challenge to all categorization.